UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/589,239	10/589,239 01/03/2007 Ivan Boule		LSN-4786-8	6941	
	7590 06/29/201 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER			
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	SADLER, NATHAN			
ARLINGTON,	VA 22205		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2189		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/29/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/589,239	BOULE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Nathan Sadler	2189		

	Nathan Sadler	2189					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 June 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ai no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100				
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of the properties of the properties of the content of the properties of the prop	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	nnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		ripliant, anonamone (i	102 021).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9,11-24,26-38,40-46 and 48</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Reginald G. Bragdon/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2189							

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claims 1-9, 11-16, and 40-46 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive.

In response to the argument that McMahon's master bitmap index is used in two different ways (page 16, paragraph 1), the Examiner is not interpreting McMahon's master bitmap index as the binary data set. The Examiner is interpreting the size parameter to malloc as the binary data set.

In response to the argument that the lookup table of claim 1 does not index levels containing free segments (page 16, paragraph 5 and page 18, paragraph 2), the limitation that it is not used to identify free segments is not present in any of the claims. If Applicants feel they have adequate support for that limitation, they are welcome to amend their claims to incorporate such limitation.

In response to the argument that the bitmaps are distinct from the lookup table and are separately claimed (page 17, paragraph 1 and page 18, paragraph 1), the master bit index serves the claimed purposes and features of both elements. "See In re Kelley, 305 F.2d 909, 915-16 [134 USPQ 397] (C.C.P.A. 1962) (noting that two limitations hypothetically can read on the same structure)." (Intellectual Prop. Dev., Inc. v. UA-Columbia Cablevision of Westchester, Inc., 336 F3d 1308, 67 USPQ2d 1385, footnote 9, CAFC 2003).

In response to the argument regarding determining the appropriate level from the lookup entry (page 18, paragraph 3 - page 19, paragraph 1), McMahon teaches determining a most significant set bit of the binary data set, and determining from the lookup table entry associated with the most significant set bit. Table 1 shows the various memory block sizes. In order to decide whether to use the first or second free list for a 32 byte request, the most significant bit would have to be used.

In response to the argument regarding determining whether a free memory sement is available (page 20, row 2), McMahon teaches doing it in exactly the same way: "Specifically, each bit flag indicates whether at least one memory block within the corresponding group is available. In one embodiment, a bit flag set as a '1' or high logic level indicates that the corresponding group contains at least one available memory block." (Col. 7, lines 19-23).